

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARQUISE D. LOFTIS,

Petitioner,

v.

JAMES HILL,

Respondent.

No. 1:23-cv-0002 JLT SKO (HC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
(Doc. 18)

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT  
OF HABEAS CORPUS AND DIRECTING  
CLERK OF COURT TO ENTER  
JUDGMENT AND CLOSE CASE  
ORDER DECLINING TO ISSUE  
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

Marquise D. Loftis is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On June 1, 2023, the assigned magistrate judge issued Findings and Recommendations to deny the petition on its merits. (Doc. 18.) On July 10, 2023, Petitioner filed a response. (Doc. 22.) Petitioner concedes that he cannot challenge the effectiveness of the assistance from the Investigative Employee. (*Id.* at 1.) In addition, Petitioner “concedes... that under Federal Law there was enough evidence to support a finding, under the ‘Some Evidence’ standard.” (*Id.*) Petitioner objects to the remaining findings of the magistrate judge. (*Id.* at 2-5.)

According to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the matter—including Petitioner’s objections—the Court

1 concludes that the Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and proper  
2 analysis.

3 In addition, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. A state prisoner  
4 seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of  
5 his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537  
6 U.S. 322, 335-336 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a certificate of  
7 appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:

8 (a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a  
9 district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court of  
appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding is held.

10 (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test  
11 the validity of a warrant to remove to another district or place for commitment or  
trial a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test  
12 the validity of such person's detention pending removal proceedings.

13 (c) (1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an  
appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from—

14 (A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the  
15 detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State  
court; or

16 (B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.

17 (2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the  
18 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional  
right.

19 (3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which  
20 specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

21 If a court denies a petitioner's petition, the court may only issue a certificate of  
22 appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.  
23 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must establish that  
24 "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have  
25 been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve  
26 encouragement to proceed further.'" *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting  
27 *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)).

28 In the present case, the Court finds that Petitioner has not made the required substantial

1 showing of the denial of a constitutional right to justify the issuance of a certificate of  
2 appealability. Reasonable jurists would not find the Court's determination that Petitioner is not  
3 entitled to federal habeas corpus relief debatable, wrong, or deserving of encouragement to  
4 proceed further. Thus, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

5 Based upon the foregoing, the Court **ORDERS**:

6 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on June 1, 2023 (Doc. 18) are adopted  
7 in full.

8 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied with prejudice.

9 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment and close the case.

10 4. The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

11 This order terminates the action in its entirety.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: September 22, 2023

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28